



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Synopses of Important Articles.

DIE ADRESSATEN DES GALATERBRIEFS (The Persons Addressed in the Galatian Epistle). By DR. CARL CLEMEN, in the *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1894, Drittes Heft. Pp. 396-424.

Not a few have taken in hand at present to set forth the arguments for the so-called South-Galatian hypothesis, which understands that the churches addressed in the Epistle to the Galatians are the churches which Paul founded on his first missionary journey. The district called Galatia is the Roman province of that name, which Augustus created in 25 B. C., and includes not only old "Galatia" but the whole central portion of Asia Minor. The question is by no means a new one, but it is being canvassed again. As supporters of this South-Galatian hypothesis Dr. Clemen cites Niemeyer, Paulus, Thiersch, Renan, Hausrath, Weizsäcker, Th. Zahn, Schenkel, Ranke, Havet, Pfeiderer, Völter, Sabatier, O. Holtzmann, Ramsay. While the current view, the so-called North-Galatian hypothesis, which supposes that Paul wrote the Galatian Epistle to certain unnamed and otherwise unknown churches in the small northern district ethnographically called Galatia, churches which he is supposed to have established at the beginning of his second missionary journey, is supported by Usteri, Anger, Rückert, Wieseler, Sieffert, Hilgenfeld, Lightfoot, Mangold, Grimm, Holsten, Davidson, Holtzmann, Weiss, Zöckler, Lipsius, Schürer, Wendt (1888), Godet, Findlay, Chase. The following arguments for the former—the South-Galatian—are then presented by Dr. Clemen. (1) Since the only two passages in the Acts in which the phrase "the Galatian district" occurs tell, one (16:6) of a journey through the land, the other (18:23) of a confirming of the brethren, the founding of the churches is assumed as having taken place; this founding must have been related somewhere, therefore, in Acts 13-14. (2) The Roman province of Galatia must be understood in 18:23, because the road from Antioch in Syria to Ephesus lay naturally through Lycaonia, and Paul would not otherwise have confirmed "all the disciples." (3) The Roman province of Galatia is also to be understood in Acts 16:6, because the direct road to Mysia passed only through it and Phrygia, but not at all through the old Galatia. (4) Since, in the list (Acts 20:4) of representatives of the churches which had contributed to the collection for the saints in Jerusalem no Galatians appear, but only Gaius and Timotheus of Derbe, the Galatian churches are to be looked for in Derbe and the other Lycaonian towns. This assumes that the list given is complete, and that it is so the author goes on to show. (5) It is improbable that Paul preached in the small district of Galatia, because he seems always to have

followed the great military roads and to have preferred the Roman colonies; whereas old Galatia was off the main lines of communication, and could not have been so easily visited by the Judaizers. (6) In the first missionary journey (Acts 13-14) both the haste at first and the change of direction afterward are explained if the "infirmity of the flesh" happened at Antioch in Phrygia. As Paul preached in Perga *afterward* (14:25), there must have been some special reason why he did not do so before. (7) If the Judaizers reproached Paul with occasionally preaching circumcision (Gal. 5:11), they must have alleged some ground for the accusation, such as on the South-Galatian theory is supplied in a striking way by the case of Timotheus. Further, Paul mentions Barnabas as well known to the readers (Gal. 2:1, 9, 13), and since he only accompanied Paul on the first missionary journey, the Galatian churches must have been founded then. Further, when Paul (Gal. 4:9) describes the Jewish feast-keeping of the Galatians as a going back to the weak and beggarly elements, to which they wish again to be in bondage, they must have formerly served similar angel powers, such as Lunus, which was worshipped at Antioch. And finally, the words of Paul (Gal. 4:14), "ye received me as an angel of God, as Christ Jesus," may point, if not directly to the scene in Acts 14:8 sq., yet to the proverbial kindness and hospitality of the Phrygians. (8) Since Paul, for the most part, employs the names of the Roman provinces, he presumably meant by "Galatia" the Roman province of that name. He always uses Achaia, Asia, Cilicia, Macedonia in this sense, and in cases where he departs from this usage explanations can be given. (9) Supposing the chronology of the Acts to be correct, it follows from Gal. 2:5, "that the truth of the Gospel might continue with you," that the churches of the letter were founded before the apostolic council, and therefore are to be sought in Lycaonia.

We have here a succinct statement of the reasons for the less common view of the destination of the Galatian Epistle. They are worthy of careful consideration. Some of them seem so strong as almost to demand recognition. Besides, there are many difficulties and some unlikely conjectures which support the current theory. Has the time come for a change of view in this particular? It is a question that calls for a thorough investigation and a candid reply. It will not be a difficult matter to adjust the Galatian Epistle to its new—or rather to its original—circumstances, in case that be the verdict. It may be hoped that the discussion will continue until the more probable view of the destination shall be settled and generally accepted.

C. W. V.

CHRISTIAN SOCIOLOGY. By Z. SWIFT HOLBROOK, in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, October, 1894.

Social reforms presuppose the reform of individuals. Christianity has for its mission the regeneration of the individual. Sociology leads, therefore, directly to biblical theology, and its very first question is: "What shall I do with Jesus which is called the Christ?"

The historical Christ is not the product of his age, or of the Hebrew genius. He was in strange contradiction to his times. Combining in himself the most opposite traits, he pursued the golden mean commended by Aristotle, and was able to exemplify the ideal citizen of Plato and Cicero in his own life. If all the world were like him, we should have the ideal social condition.

And what is true of his character is true of his teachings. The sociological student will find his task much simplified by adhering closely to Christ's estimate of man—and especially to his view of sin. But great care must be exercised in determining just what Christ's teachings are. There are three methods of ascertaining his mind; the fair interpretation of his words; the interpretation of his actions; the determination of his spirit and motive as they are revealed in his followers of all ages.

While it is desirable thus to learn Christ's mind upon social questions, it must be confessed that he never came to earth to teach political economy, or the science of government, art, or ethics. Nor did he announce his purpose to save society except as society is saved through its units. But the Christian consciousness has evolved a system of economics that so far as our age is Christian and civilized, and is capable of understanding Christ, is simple and clear. Political economy must always go hand in hand with ethics, and sociology looks to both for the data of its generalizations.

Christ's teachings on selfhood and altruism are an attempt to make neither one's self nor one's neighbor=0. The history of various attempts to accomplish either are unnatural and absurd. Selfishness is not self-interest. To confound the two is misleading, and accounts for the pessimistic wails of the chair of Applied Christianity in Iowa College. Indeed, most of the indictments against society today result from confusing the noble traits that have their origin in self=1, with the perversion of those traits based either upon God=0, or neighbor=0, or self=0. The true equations are God= ∞ , self=1, neighbor=1. We account for the equality of self and neighbor only by admitting the infinity of God.

From this interpretation of the Royal Law, we get correct views of the vexed economic and social questions of today. The doctrine of property becomes that of Christian stewardship, which is at once opposed to the ravings of socialists and the avarice of trusts. The doctrine of benevolence includes that of justice and calls out Winchester rifles in defense of property rights, no less than it feeds the hungry. The theory and practice of labor organizations, as well as the proposal of the single-tax theorists, must be tried by this standard of justice.

In the new era that is approaching, the Christ will speak peace to present troubles, and out of the struggles of today will come a new and more Christian civilization.

This article may be regarded as the inaugural address of its author, who, with this number of the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, becomes the editor of a new department in that magazine—that of Christian Sociology. In the minds of many earnest Christians this

new department will be regarded with some suspicion, since few persons outside a specially interested circle distinguish between sociology and socialism. This unhappy confusion of two terms that resemble each other only in their spelling cannot long continue in the mind of any person who reads this vigorous article. If the new department is to be conducted along such lines as are here predicted, it will be a power in the development of a right attitude of the Christian public towards those social problems that we are forced to admit exist.

Some of the propositions of the author we are inclined to question. His view of the present condition of political economy seems optimistically vague, and his concluding paragraph runs dangerously near mere rhetoric. He further fails carefully to indicate the content of sociology in general, or to justify the use of such an absurd term as Christian Sociology. Why should we speak of a Christian Sociology any more than of a Christian Logic or a Christian History?

It is to be hoped that in the fifty pages of sociological material promised in each issue of the *Bibliotheca Sacra* a large amount of space will be given to a sober exegesis of such teachings of the New Testament as have any bearing upon social life and institutions. We have had more than enough of undigested, hysterical studies based on what it is *supposed* the New Testament teaches. Let us find out now whether Jesus had any social teachings, and if so, what they really were. And in the meantime if the teachings of Christ are to appear in social studies, let us hope that sociologists will undertake to know a little more about exegesis and "Christian sociologists" a little more about sociology.

S. M.

THE MESSIANIC TEACHING OF ISAIAH. By WILLIAM A. SHEDD, in the *Presbyterian and Reformed Review* for October, 1894. Pp. 575-591.

The critical problems of the Old Testament literature arise from the relations of the literature to the history. The reconstruction of the literature is dependent on a reconstructed history. It is assumed in this paper that the prophetic use of the future is analogous to historical illustration rather than historical narrative, and that prophecy is primarily preaching, and secondarily prediction. The predictive element is itself conditioned by the conscious purpose of the prophets as quickeners of the public conscience, rebukers of national sin, or comforters of the faithful. Therefore every part of prophecy is related to and best interpreted in the circumstances of its delivery. On the other hand the interpretation for the prophet's own day may be a very partial interpretation for our own day. The spirit of prophecy is the spirit of Christ—not the spirit of the age—and "not unto themselves, but unto us did they minister these things."

The comparison of the Messianic teaching with the history shows a close connection between them, resulting in adaptation in the form of the former and progress in content. In Jotham's time the prophet aimed at reformation, and hence presented the ideal holiness of the city and the people. Next, in Ahaz's time the Messianic king was foremost in the prophet's mind. Finally, in Hezekiah's reign, the Messianic salvation is presented in a double aspect, as sure, and hence the sheet anchor for the ship of state, as *abundant*, and

hence a source of comfort to the individual believer. The Messianic teaching may thus be considered in relation to the three great functions of the prophet, as a preacher of righteousness, as a counselor of the state, and as a comforter of the faithful.

As a preacher of righteousness, his Messianic ideals ever stood in striking contrast to the then existing evils. The disgraceful reality is placed side by side with the glorious ideal, which the prophet always declared to be possible. The contrast brought out each the more prominently. When, on the highway of the fuller's field, prophet stood face to face with king, the sight of the faithless, fearful heir of David's throne brought before Isaiah's mind him who should fulfill the covenant made with David. Ahaz and Immanuel stand in sharp contrast—the former of royal birth and luxurious raising, the latter the son of a nameless maiden and nurtured on the plain food of a poor people—curds and honey. Ahaz, weak and vacillating, shall bring down upon his nation in judgment darker days than any since the great disruption (7:17). Immanuel is called Wonderful, Counselor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace, and shall establish the kingdom forever in righteousness (9:6). The strongest rebuke of the actual was the portrayal of the ideal king. In the face of the king's lack of faith the Messiah flashed before the prophet, and was presented to Ahaz as the supreme and final test of faith. To imagine that this "sign" must be of immediate occurrence in order to be applicable to Ahaz, is to deprive Messianic prophecy of its great glory. The emphasis is neither on the time nor the manner of the birth, but upon the certainty of God's purpose therein exemplified, a purpose involving both punishment and deliverance.

As the counselor of the state, Isaiah has given us a series of Messianic pictures, portraying that ideal state which in the divine purpose was to be realized. Here also contrast is one of the most striking elements. Present imperfections are to completely disappear. Even the land itself is to become fertile and well-watered. Foes shall vanish. Zion shall stand unmoved, triumphant. The prophet's faith is unbounded and is based upon the Messianic promise. His theology determined and idealized his political counsels. Thus with his choicest and most spiritual weapons he fought the spirit of political unbelief.

As the comforter of the faithful in their trials and troubles, Isaiah appears with the most glowing Messianic hopes, at two crises in the nation's history. The first is when Sargon invades the Canaanitish world, and the other when, in 701 B. C., Sennacherib carries terror to the very walls of Jerusalem.

When we come to chapters 40–66 we are in a different atmosphere. The point of view, is changed. The central figure is no longer the Messianic king, but the mysterious servant who can scarcely be distinguished from the people. The most plausible explanation is that the change is due to a change in time and place; that an unknown prophet speaks to exiles about to return to Palestine. However, some of the difficulties of such a theory are apparent on its

face, for example, the very suggestion that the greatest of the prophets is an Unknown. Further, there is not a single passage in these sections which contains a definite reference to the Arabian desert as the route of the returning exiles. The whole conception is not in the realm of prosaic geography, but of poetry. The result of pressing this Messianic figure into close conformity with the theory of an exilic authorship is to forget the redemption of the land in the lesser glory of the return. The prophecy even transcends any literal return to Palestine in any age. There is no dividing line between the return of the exiles from captivity and the Messianic age. The fuller and more glorious the Messianic vision, the greater the difficulty in bringing it so near. Likewise the difficulty of conceiving of the servant as undergoing the life of suffering and the death of contumely, and also being the agent in effecting the restoration, is apparent. It is much easier to think of these elements as being blended in the perspective of distance than in the mind of a prophet living in the midst of the exile.

The writer brings out with remarkable clearness the intimate relation between the form and content of each Messianic prophecy, and the circumstances under which it was uttered; and in so doing has accented a point which is often overlooked. When he comes to the consideration of chapters 40-66, one is disappointed to find that he spends most of his time trying to establish their Isaiah authorship with arguments (which with many scholars would hardly counterbalance the opposing data which he himself admits), and consequently hardly touches upon the rich Messianic teachings contained in these chapters. The careful, historical spirit manifested in the treatment of the earlier chapters, leads the reader to hope that at some later period the work thus well begun will be completed.

C. F. K.

DIE NEUEREN KRITISCHEN FORSCHUNGEN ÜBER DIE APOKALYPSE JOHANNIS. VON DR. W. BALDENSPERGER, Professor der Theologie in Giessen, in the *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, iv. Bd., pp. 232-250.

Recent criticism is essentially theological as contrasted with the older literary-historical. Such at least can be said of all recent work on the Apocalypse. Weizsäcker spoke, perhaps, the first word in the more recent discussion, stating that he had been long of the opinion that we have in the Apocalypse a compilation, some parts of which are, to be sure, of very early date, and testify to the wide exercise of prophetic gift. This theory Weizsäcker discussed elaborately in the second edition of his *Apostolic Age in the Christian Church*. Soon after Völter put forth his theory, not of compilation, but of redaction, distinguishing five layers, ranging from A. D. 65-140. Vischer, a pupil of Harnack, maintained, in 1886, that the book was simply the translation into Greek of a Jewish Apocalypse, written at any rate before 70, with an introduction and conclusion and with comparatively slight interpolation and interpretations throughout by a Christian hand toward the end of the first century. The strongest argument for the hypothesis of Vischer is its amazing

simplicity. He has made luminously clear the fact and nature of the counter-currents of the book. Weyland, a Dutch scholar, had at the same time, with Vischer and quite independently, hit upon a solution differing from Vischer's only in the assumption of two Jewish sources, written in Greek, however, instead of one. The older of these Jewish sources is of the time of Nero; specifically after the defeat of Cestius Gallus, at the time when Vespasian assumed the command. The younger belonged to the time of Titus, and was written by a Jew of the Diaspora who had seen the ruins of Jerusalem. The Christian revision is of the time of Trajan and here, again, the contribution of the Christian author is not large. These two Jewish sources Weyland marks x and z; the latter so, because we come upon it second in the order of the narrative. It is, however, the older. It begins with chap. 10, and contains 11.1-14:11 and cc. 19:11-21; 20:1-21:8.

The French scholars Sabatier and Schön have turned the hypothesis about and assume that the basis and structure of the book are Christian, and that the author, writing toward the end of the first century, has simply taken up into his work now smaller and now larger pieces of Jewish oracles, familiar and sacred, some of them from before the fall of Jerusalem. Schön has made one thing clear, namely: the fact that much that is to be assigned to Jewish influences is not therewith, by any means, made out as of Jewish authorship; very much of that sort of thing might exist in the mind and memory of a Jewish-Christian author, and influence him perhaps unconsciously. One of the most important contributions is that of Friedrich Spitta (*Die Offenbarung des Johannes untersucht*, 1889). The original writing is a Christian one of John Mark, about 86 A. D.; but this is to be distinguished from the work of a Christian reviser, forty years later, who had, beside the Christian, two Jewish sources at his disposal, one of them of the time of Pompeius, and the second of that of Caligula (the *θηρίον* of c. 13). These are all complete apocalypses, and the redactor has not much to do to work them together. Paul Schmidt in his "Notes on the Composition of the Revelation of John," (1891), goes even farther than Spitta, leaving only introduction and conclusion, the work of redaction, and an occasional interpolation to the Christian hand. The main part of the whole is the so-called "Book of the Messiah," 12:1-22:5, to which were later inserted 14:6-20, and 17:1-19:5. There were altogether three distinct Jewish sources and these are thought to have been translated into Greek by a redactor.

Karl Erber (*Die Offenbarung Johannis, kritisch untersucht*) returns to Völter's and Weizsäcker's theories, agreeing, however, in some details with Spitta (the *θηρίον* of chap. 13=Caligula, etc.). The Caligula apocalypse was incorporated into the larger work of the Apostle John, written in Ephesus, about A. D. 62, and about 80 all the sources were combined by a Jewish Christian, who now refers chap. 13 to the Roman world power and Nero.

Baldensperger believes that the author (or authors) of the Apocalypse, like those of all apocalypses, were not theologians, but preachers, reviving

hope, spreading fear; not logicians but impressionists to whom everything was welcome that helped them to reach their aim. He rejects the hypothesis of the Jewish origin of the original apocalypse (*Grundschrift*) because Christian readers would never be willing to accept such as a Christian book. He holds to a Jewish-Christian origin of the *Grundschrift* (either chaps. 1-10, or 1-7); the Jewish coloring of the later additions would then easily explain the prejudice against the whole book found among early Christians.

Such in briefest terms is the summary of Baldensperger's article, which, being itself a summary, it would be impossible to condense still further without losing the main points under discussion. It is a very able and grasping treatment of all the important contributions toward the criticism of the Apocalypse. Jülicher's *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (Freiburg, 1894), appeared after the publication of Baldensperger's article. It is interesting to note his position. Jülicher believes in a Jewish-Christian origin of the Apocalypse (*cf.* 11:1, etc.). The author was a Christian from Asia Minor (1:1, 4, 9, etc.), having come there from Palestine in his later years. A study of the linguistic features proves that the author of the Apocalypse cannot have been the same as that of the fourth Gospel and the Epistles, nor can he have been acquainted with that literature. The Apocalypse is the work of a Christian of about A. D. 95, who incorporated into his work at several places older apocalyptic visions, whose origin and original character, Jewish or Christian, it will never be possible to determine with any degree of certainty.

W. M.-A.